



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/553,183

07/21/2006

Matthias Fies

C 2684 PCT/US

2216

23657

7590

04/09/2009

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP
2000 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

CAMERON, ERMA C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/09/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/553,183	Applicant(s) FIES ET AL.	
	Examiner /Erma Cameron/	Art Unit 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The rejection of Claims 6-8, 10-13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CA 2307565 is withdrawn because of the arguments presented in the 12/29/2008 amendment.

3. Claims 6-8, 10-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 10 - 218946.

See Abstracts and partial machine translation.

'946 teaches a dimerdiol di(meth)acrylate in a heat or radiation curable coating (see Abstracts; claims; [0004]-[0006]). The degree of esterification appears to at least overlap with that claimed by applicant. The flattening properties are inherent to the coating composition.

Response to Arguments

The applicant has argued that '946 teaches an alkoxylated dimerdiol. That is correct, but '946 also teaches that there is present di(meth)acrylate of dimerdiol as component B (see claim

Art Unit: 1792

1). This is a component that meets the limitations of dimerdiol (meth)acrylate, being 100% esterified.

4. The rejection of Claims 9, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CA 2307565 or JP 10 – 218946, either taken in view of Sigel et al (6572932) is withdrawn because of the arguments in the 12/29/2008 amendment.

5. Claims 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/58030.

‘030 teaches DPGDA (dipropylene glycol diacrylate, one of the compounds used by applicant; also known as Photomer 4226; see CAS Registry file printout of RN 57472-68-1) at 10-40 wt%, as well as silica, to obtain photocurable matt coatings (see Abstract; pp 2, 4, 5, 6 and claims).

6. Claims 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thames et al (6001913).

‘913 teaches a UV curable coating composition that comprises 17 wt % Photomer 3016, one of the compounds used by applicant, and therefore inherently meeting the esterification and flattening limitations, as well as silica (see Abstract; 10:53-61; 12:31-65; Example 8).

Art Unit: 1792

Silica is known as a solid flattening agent.

7. Claims 6-8, 10-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gloster et al (uS2004/0006157).

‘157 teaches a UV curable ink that contains 20% Photomer 4226, one of the compounds used by applicant, and therefore inherently meeting the esterification and flattening limitations (see Abstract; Table on page 4, Examples 1 and 2).

8. Claims 6-7, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayan et al (6239189).

‘189 teaches radiation curable ink or coating material that comprises Photomer 3016, one of the compounds used by applicant, and therefore inherently meeting the esterification and flattening limitations, as well as silica, which is known to be a solid flattening agent (see Abstract; 1:13-19; 3:57-65; Example 5).

Double Patenting

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined

Art Unit: 1792

application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 6-16 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-26 of copending Application No. 10/553483. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each is a (meth)acrylate- and dimerdiol-based flattening composition.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The examiner acknowledges that the applicant has requested that this rejection be held in abeyance. This will be done.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /Erma Cameron/ whose telephone number is 571-272-1416. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 1792

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Erma Cameron/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1792

April 7, 2009